

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-23 stand rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Carneal et al. (WO 99/08429), hereinafter referred to as Carneal. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent claim 1 includes “said child and parent proxy servers establish a persistent transmission control protocol (TCP) link between said mobile platform and said ground station.” Applicants respectfully assert the Examiner is improperly interpreting Carneal as Carneal fails to disclose this feature as claimed whatsoever.

Carneal appears to disclose merely a prefetch configuration using a distributed proxy server which “caches web objects until requested by a browser.” (Page 4, lines 21-23). Carneal fails to mention, however, the use of a TCP link. Accordingly, Applicants assert independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 20 are patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19 and 21-23 depend from either independent claims 1, 7, 13 or 20, these claims are also believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Chrungoo et al. (“Smart Proxy: Reducing Latency for HTTP Based Web Transfers

Across Satellite Links" December 2000), hereafter referred to as Chrungoo. This rejection has been rendered moot.


Applicants enclose herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 and associated evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 stating that the present invention was at least conceived in this country prior to December 17, 2000, the publication date of Chrungoo, and thereafter that efforts were diligently made to reduce the invention to practice. Therefore, Chrungoo is not a valid prior art reference to the presently pending claims and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of he claims based on Chrungoo. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: June 10, 2004
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps

Respectfully submitted,
By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686